January 25,1974

Cyril H. Wecht, M.D.,J.D.,F.C.A.P.
Office of Coroner
Allegheny County
542 Fourth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Penna. 15219

Dear sir,

A puzzling paragraph in your article, The Medical Evidence In The Assassination of President JOHN F. Kennedy, which appeared in the September 1973 issue of Forensic Science Gazette, it seems to me, is in need of clarification. In the section,Interpretation of the Data, subsection,Relevant Collateral Data, on page 16, head of column two, you wrote:

> Motion pictures taken during the assassination show that when the President received his head wound, his head was momentarily drive forward about two inches. About one-ninth of a second later (two frames of the film), his head begins a backward and leftward movement, along with the upper part of his body, until he has fallen over to the left side of the car.

It is not clear whether you meant to describe what you saw in the motion picture film or in the still color slides of individual frames derived from the film. Nor is it clear whether you meant to describe a forward motion of the President's head of about two inches in the film(or slides) or in fact.

You used the phrase "his head wound." Presumably this was the fatal wound. The implication of the use of the singular noun, "wound," is, of course, one bullet caused this one wound. From what direction did this bullet strike the President's haed? On page 15 you wrote,"Because of the extensive loss of skull, it cannot be absolutely ascertained that no more than one bullet struck the President's head, at least from the available autopsy photographs and X-rays. However, one entry wound is deifinitely identifiable, and its location high on the rear of the skull points to a rearward location for the source of the

shot."

But you made no effort to interpret the contradictory motions of the President's head - first forward(about two inches), then, with the upper part of his body, backward and leftward (until he fell over to the left). Could one bullet achieve so much? Is the contradiction not resolved by positing two bullets origination from behind and in front of the President? Isn't that what the motion pictures show?

I saw the motion pictures of the assassination of President Kennedy in the National Archives in September 1965 when they were made available for public inspection, and made a report a part of which Sylvia Meagher found relevant to the theme of her Accessories After the Fact. A copy is enclosed. Also enclosed is a copy of a letter to Paul Hoch, emphasizing the crucial and decisive evidentiary import of the Zapruder film which, unfortunately, has been overlooked or neglected, or regarded as of secondaty significance, as collateral data. Any comment you can find time to make on these matters and documents is eagerly anticipated and will be much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Thomas Stamm

Thomas Stamm

2705 Bainbridge Ave

Bronx New York 10458